

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejects Claims 12, 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelly et al. 12 and 15-21 anticipated by Kelly et al. The examiner states that Kelly discloses an arbitration circuit for an output port comprising a FIFO queue 831 containing a head pointer and a plurality of characterizing data for each packet received, a data portion of the packet being stored in a common memory and the examiner refers to col.9, lines 35-64 and col.4, lines 50-65 ie the output buffer also common memory which included the selected packets which included data portion and head pointer for each transaction the queue forming a look-up table to determine which data will be sent out from the output port.

We cannot agree. First of all, there is a distinction between a “header” which is a set of fields that appear at the front of a packet that contain the information required to determine the characteristics and purpose of the packet and a “head pointer” which is the start address for the received packet which the present invention stores in the common memory. Secondly, the examiner talks about a common memory but Kelly does not disclose such. In Kelly any received packet is stored in the port input buffer. An internal arbitration circuit 816, 847, 849 moves the received packet in input buffer 831, 839, 841 to its target output buffer 819, 843, 845 through X-BAR switch 833. The next packet and output buffer of each virtual channel at each output port needs to arbitrate for access to the port SERDES in order to send the packet to the PCI Express I/O link. This implementation requires moving each received packet twice at each port for each virtual channel. It stores the received packet in the input buffer, then moves the packet to the output buffer of the target output port. Each output buffer only contains the packet data for its’ own virtual channel, there are eight output buffers for a total of eight virtual channels at each port. One cannot call the output buffer as a common memory, because each is a physically separate memory for each virtual channel at each port.

The examiner states in the response to amendment that he believes that certain features upon which we rely for on our previous argument were not recited in the

rejected claims. Although Applicants believe that the claims did recite these features, Applicants have amended this in order to clarify this for the examiner. In view of the confusion about the head pointer, Claim 12 now recites that the head pointer is to data stored in a common memory for a plurality of ports and that wherein a data portion of the packet is stored only in the common memory. This should clearly distinguish the present invention over the Kelly et al reference cited by the examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

/William B Kempler/
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
Tel.: (972) 917-5452